

# Customer Satisfaction Survey of Indian Tribal Governments



Office of Indian Tribal Governments  
Tax Exempt Government Entities Division

September 2008

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>2008 ITG CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Balanced Measures and the Office of Indian Tribal Governments</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Purpose</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<i>Response Rate</i> .....	2
<i>Response Bias</i> .....	4
<b>FINDINGS FROM 2008 ITG CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>The Questionnaire Scale</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Survey Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Special Analysis</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b> .....	<b>12</b>

## INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1 Survey Responses by ITG Field Group.....	3
Table 2 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results - by Question Order.....	5
Table 3 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results-by Rank (1-26).....	6
Table 4 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results-by Rank (28-41).....	7
Table 5 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores-by Area of Customer Satisfaction.....	8
Table 6 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores- by ITG Field Group.....	9
Table 7 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores - Special Analysis.....	10

## **2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey**

### **Balanced Measures and the Office of Indian Tribal Governments**

The Office of Indian Tribal Governments (ITG) is located within the Tax Exempt/ Government Entities (TE/GE) Business Unit. ITG's customers are 562 federally recognized tribes. ITG seeks to provide all of the services that tribes need in order to fully administer federal tax laws and to provide tribes with information they require to further their economic development without risk of federal tax concerns.

As part of the IRS, the Office of Indian Tribal Governments (ITG) is required to utilize balanced measures for employee satisfaction, business results, and customer satisfaction. The use of measures across these three areas allows the organization to better assess the effectiveness of its programs.

The balanced measure "Customer Satisfaction" is one of the "five levers of change" identified by former Commissioner Rossotti to modernize the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Each of the Balanced Measures is supported by three strategic goals: Service to Each Taxpayer; Service to All Taxpayers; and Productivity through a Quality Work Environment. This research will allow us to determine the level of customer satisfaction espoused by our customers. It will also allow us to evaluate our programs to see where we need to improve our performance.

### **Purpose**

ITG conducted the 2008 Customer Satisfaction Survey to obtain feedback from our customers that will allow us to measure customer satisfaction with our products and services. This research is an important part of measuring our performance within the context of the aforesaid "Customer Satisfaction" balanced measure. This report summarizes the findings ITG obtained from the survey. The information collected from this survey is important for several reasons.

One, it will enable ITG to identify program areas where we are meeting our customers' expectations as well as those areas where improvement is needed. The survey feedback will allow ITG to reallocate/assign resources within our annual Work Plan to produce and/or improve those products/ services that are important to our customers.

Two, it will allow us to contrast the level of customer satisfaction espoused by our customers with the results from similar surveys conducted in previous years. This annual assessment will create opportunities for us to identify areas where our initiatives are working or have failed, and will allow ITG to modify and/or design new programs and initiatives to better address our customers' needs.

## **Background**

Our research began in April 2001, when a group of our employees met in a brainstorming session to develop a list of products and services that we thought were important to the tribal governments. We broke the list down to find the positive aspects and negative attributes of each product/service and created measures. The measures were then ranked in terms of the perceived importance to the tribes. Next, we met with representatives of the Five Civilized Tribes for a focus group to determine their needs and concerns.<sup>1</sup> After studying the results of the focus group we changed the ranking of our measures, as our perception of the tribes' needs was slightly different from their perception.

As part of this effort, we prioritized and selected the measures best suited to fit the needs of our customers. The aforementioned measures were then used to develop a customer satisfaction questionnaire. The questionnaire was slightly modified over the years, largely to provide additional clarity to certain questions. A copy of the 2008 survey questionnaire is included in the Appendix. An implementation plan for the survey was drafted that included the questionnaire. A copy of the implementation plan can be obtained by calling the Manager for ITG Group 7289. The implementation plan was subsequently approved by the Office of Management and Budget. Finally, we successfully conducted a mail survey this past summer with our customers.

Starting with the FY 2007 survey, ITG added several questions measuring the success of our contacts with customers who had undergone any type of compliance action (e.g Compliance Check, Examination, etc) in the past year. This year sixty respondents answered these additional "Compliance Action" questions.

## ***Response Rate***

The questionnaire was mailed out to 562 federally recognized tribes, as well as 110 Navajo Chapters<sup>2</sup>, beginning on July 1, 2008. The survey officially ended on August 29th. The following actions were taken by ITG to boost our response rate:

- ITG management reminded the tribes about the survey, and encouraged their participation in the survey during various meetings that were held prior to the survey effort.
- ITG Specialists asked tribes to participate during all contacts with tribes during the period of the survey
- ITG News issuances for July 2008 contained a national article on the pending survey, and were used to promote the survey and seek participation.
- The Director, ITG signed a cover letter that accompanied each survey mailed to tribes in which she asked for their participation.
- Telephone and e-mail contacts were made with tribal designees to alert them to the mailing of the survey and to encourage them to respond.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Five Civilized tribes are located in Oklahoma.

<sup>2</sup> The Navajo Chapters, as well as Alaska Villages and Tribes are unique subsets within the context of ITG and are measured separately.

- A follow-up postcard was mailed to every tribe on July 29, 2008 to remind them of the survey, and to encourage their participation.

ITG received 193 responses from the tribes during this period. This results in a response rate of 29%. From "The Survey Research Handbook," by Alreck and Settle, the researchers state, "Mail surveys with response rates over 30 percent are rare. Response rates are often only about 5 or 10 percent."<sup>3</sup> Previous contact with the National American Indian Housing Council indicated they have 500-600 customers and mainly deal with the housing authority within federally recognized tribes. Our contact said they have conducted many surveys and they usually receive a response rate between 7-13%.

In addition, contact with Tribal Data Resources (TDR), a privately owned company that compiles data on tribes such as tribal membership, current political leaders, etc., was made to ascertain their experience. TDR updates their database annually, and they must contact each tribe to accomplish this task. They stated that anyone who achieved a response rate of 25-30% was doing "really well." Based upon the aforesaid historical response rates, ITG is pleased with a response rate of 29% (up from 26% in 2007), yet still striving to reach previous response levels such as the 35% received in 2004<sup>4</sup>

**Table 1 Survey Responses by ITG Field Group**

<b>2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results</b>		
7280	24	38%
7281	19	32%
7282	12	25%
7283	40	33%
7284	16	37%
Alaska	53	23%
Navajo Chapters	29	26%
Total	193	29%

Our market segments have traditionally been broken out by three levels: tribes located in Alaska, tribes located outside of Alaska without gaming, tribes located outside of Alaska with gaming. When determining our customer satisfaction levels, we need to break out the Navajo Chapters as well, since both the Navajo Chapters and Alaska Villages present unique circumstances and special needs for assistance, outreach and compliance issues. We are pleased that this year's survey shows increased response rate in almost every group, with 7284 leading the way with an 11% increase over last year. Other gains were noted in Navajo Chapters with an 8% increase and Group 7282 up 6%.

<sup>3</sup> Page 35.

<sup>4</sup> ITG recognizes the Office of Management and Budget standards are higher. ITG will continue to look for ways to improve our response rate.

## ***Response Bias***

There are a number of ways the results from a survey may contain some bias. One example might include the survey instrument itself, the questionnaire, which may be written in a manner that yields biased responses. ITG has made several efforts to try and eliminate the possibility that our survey results are biased. Some of these efforts were included in the design of the questionnaire and/or the implementation of the survey (e.g. allowing the respondents to the survey to maintain their anonymity). ITG cannot say definitively that these and other actions have precluded any response bias. Rather, ITG can say that concrete steps were taken to try and minimize the potential for response bias.

Yet another type of bias is called *non-response bias*. This situation may occur when the opinions, values, etc. expressed by the respondents are quite different from those held by the customers who did not reply. If the non-response bias is severe enough, it can render the results of the survey invalid. In other words, the results reported from the survey do not accurately reflect the opinions, values, etc. the survey researcher intended to measure for the survey group. In this survey, we are cognizant of the possibility that the opinions of the tribes that did respond to our survey may be more favorable than the opinions of tribes that did not respond. Given that nearly 2/3rds of our customers did not respond, the reader is advised the opinions reflected in our responses may be slightly more favorable than those opinions held by tribes that did not respond. ITG has made an effort to discern if our respondents are generally representative of the different market segments of tribes that we have previously defined in our market segmentation report.

## **Findings From 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey**

### **The Questionnaire Scale**

A Likert Scale was used for most of the questions. On this scale, a “1” indicated the respondent strongly agreed with the statement. A response of “5” indicated the respondent strongly disagree with the statement. A response of 3 indicated the respondent was neutral on their agreement/disagreement with the proposed statement. For purposes of analysis, we have lumped together the “1s” with the “2s” and the “4s” with the “5s”.

The reader is also reminded that some of the proposed questions (statements) were written such that an answer of “5-strongly disagree” was a good response. We have reversed the results from these statements to ensure they are readily comparable to statements that were written in the affirmative to maintain a consistent presentation of our findings. This change is reflected in the tables.

The “lumping” of scores together is an approach the IRS has used to evaluate scores received during its Employee Satisfaction Survey. We hope the consistent use of this approach will make it easier to understand the results from our Customer Satisfaction Survey and enhance their usefulness.

## Survey Results

The results from the survey are summarized in the following Tables 2 and 3. We created a measure equal to the difference between the aggregate number of “good” and “bad” scores. This measure is shown in the right columns of Tables 2 and 3, with results from the current survey contrasted to the results from the FY 2007 and FY 2006 surveys. The lower the difference the greater the perceived dissatisfaction expressed by our customers. The “difference” is a useful measure in that it allows one to quickly identify those areas where ITG has pronounced differences in customer satisfaction. Table 2 reflects the response rates in order of the questions (statements) asked on the questionnaire.

**Table 2 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results - by Question Order**

Question	Questionnaire Response Scores (percentages)			Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2008	Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2007	Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2006
	Good	Neutral	Bad			
1	113	35	24	89	86	78
2	112	31	29	83	80	84
3	159	15	11	148	132	120
4	107	41	22	85	61	87
5	172	8	4	168	150	138
6	110	45	16	94	90	88
7	121	37	16	105	96	113
8	130	25	25	105	86	93
9	104	37	22	82	75	83
10	85	43	34	51	66	63
11	120	27	17	103	97	108
12	94	48	15	79	75	70
13	138	21	14	124	106	119
14	121	33	15	106	97	117
15	97	40	27	70	75	78
16	114	40	16	98	105	119
17	104	49	6	98	87	92
18	149	20	6	143	128	132
19	151	19	9	142	133	141
20	110	46	12	98	84	97
21	124	35	10	114	102	97
22	79	51	19	60	56	63
23	118	33	20	98	93	106
24	95	46	24	71	72	82
25	85	62	9	76	83	83
26	131	30	12	119	106	119

One can see that in Table 3 we have taken the questions in Table 2 and rearranged them by ascending order of those that have the smallest difference between the “good” (1/2) and “bad” (4/5) scores. The narrower the difference the greater the need to address the issue raised within the question (statement). For example the lowest figure calculated in the difference column in Table 3 was 51, which occurred with question (statement) 10. Question 10 reads, “The Office of ITG does not explain how tax law changes affect the Tribe.” This is one area where ITG might reexamine its products/services and the way they are delivered to see if any changes can be made that would improve the tribes’ satisfaction with our performance in this area.

**Table 3 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results-by Rank (1-26)**

Question	Questionnaire Response Scores (percentages)			Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2008	Rank FY 2008	Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2007	Rank FY 2007	Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2006	Rank FY 2006
	Good	Neutral	Bad						
10	85	43	34	51	1	66	3	63	1
22	79	51	19	60	2	56	1	63	2
15	97	40	27	70	3	75	6	78	5
24	95	46	24	71	4	72	4	82	6
25	85	62	9	76	5	83	9	83	8
12	94	48	15	79	6	75	5	70	3
9	104	37	22	82	7	75	7	83	7
2	112	31	29	83	8	80	8	84	9
4	107	41	22	85	9	61	2	87	10
1	113	35	24	89	10	86	12	78	4
6	110	45	16	94	11	90	14	88	11
20	110	46	12	98	12	84	10	97	14
17	104	49	6	98	13	87	13	92	12
23	118	33	20	98	14	93	15	106	16
16	114	40	16	98	15	105	20	119	21
11	120	27	17	103	16	97	17	108	17
8	130	25	25	105	17	86	11	93	13
7	121	37	16	105	18	96	16	113	18
14	121	33	15	106	19	97	18	117	19
21	124	35	10	114	20	102	19	97	15
26	131	30	12	119	21	106	21	119	22
13	138	21	14	124	22	106	22	119	20
19	151	19	9	142	23	133	25	141	26
18	149	20	6	143	24	128	23	132	24
3	159	15	11	148	25	132	24	120	23
5	172	8	4	168	26	150	26	138	25

Conversely, in Table 3 one can observe the widest difference was 150, which occurred with question (statement) 5. Question 5 reads, “Forms, Publications and other written materials are available on the IRS internet site”. ITG scored relatively high in this area. It would be a good idea to share this information within the ITG organization to let the employees know where ITG is performing relatively well.

Table 3 also shows relative consistency of responses between the last 3 surveys. For example, questions 10 and 22 have ranked in the top 5 in each of the surveys, indicating that ITG still needs to effect improvements in the opinion of their customers. Conversely, ITG has made significant progress over the past 3 surveys in areas relating to questions 1, 8, 12 and 21. ITG should review the issues/actions that relate to those areas to see if it can leverage from those efforts to effect similar improvements in other areas.

In Table 4, we have similarly ranked the 14 new Compliance Action questions. The lowest figure calculated in the difference column in Table 4 was 29, which occurred with question (statement) 29. Question 29 reads, “The Tribe was satisfied with the length of the examination process, from first notice through resolution.” This is an area where ITG should focus efforts to increase the satisfaction of the customers. The next three lowest figures concern all three questions in the “Final Resolution” area of Compliance Actions, mimicking last year. ITG needs to determine if the resolution documents/explanations are truly confusing to the tribes, or is this perhaps a reaction to an unfavorable outcome.

**Table 4 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Results-by Rank (28-41)**

Question	Questionnaire Response Scores (percentages)			Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2008	Rank FY 2008	Difference (Good-Bad) FY 2007	Rank FY 2007
	Good	Neutral	Bad				
29	36	9	7	29	1	30	5
39	32	9	2	30	2	28	2
40	33	9	3	30	3	28	3
41	36	8	3	33	4	28	4
37	37	7	3	34	5	33	7
36	38	5	3	35	6	41	9
30	40	8	5	35	7	43	10
38	38	8	1	37	8	11	1
35	38	7	1	37	9	38	8
28	44	7	5	39	10	33	6
34	43	9	2	41	11	44	11
32	48	6	0	48	12	48	13
33	50	3	1	49	13	46	12
31	50	3	1	49	14	53	14

In examining those areas that have relatively low scores, ITG should consider several factors in evaluating what type of follow-up action is warranted. These factors include:

- The degree of control ITG has on the aforesaid area (e.g., ITG has less control over the ease of understanding forms and publications)
- The amount of resources needed to make an improvement(s) in one area where ITG scored low vis-à-vis other areas with similar scores
- The perceived impact on the IRS mission from making an improvement(s) in a given area
- The impact external factors have on customer satisfaction within the given area (e.g., tribes may view certain legislation passed by the U.S. Congress as unfair and a sign ITG does not want to work with them even though ITG had little if any influence over the legislation)

**Table 5 2008 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores-by Area of Customer Satisfaction**

Area*	Questionnaire Response Scores (percentages) FY 2008			Questionnaire Response Scores (percentages) FY 2007		
	Good	Neutral	Bad	Good	Neutral	Bad
Burden/Delivery of Information	73%	17%	10%	73%	17%	10%
Collaborate	62%	24%	14%	63%	26%	11%
Recognition	70%	20%	11%	70%	22%	7%
Protocol/Horizontal Equity	75%	20%	5%	76%	18%	5%
Accuracy/Timeliness/Honesty	59%	30%	11%	63%	26%	11%
Compliance-Overall Satisfaction	75%	15%	11%	72%	14%	14%
Compliance-Initial Meeting	88%	10%	2%	86%	8%	6%
Compliance-Subsequent Interactions	81%	15%	4%	77%	12%	11%
Compliance-Final Resolution	75%	19%	6%	70%	18%	11%

\*See the ITG Balanced Measures Task Force Report for a detailed explanation of these areas.

In Table 5, we have provided the survey findings broken out among the nine components that make up our customer satisfaction measures. Of the original five measures used by ITG, three have declined in the past year, while two remained the same. The lowest scores are shown in areas “Collaborate” and “Accuracy, Timeliness and Honesty”. The specific questions in these areas with the lowest scores are questions 9, 10, 12, 22, 24 and 25. These are prime areas for further study and remedial action by ITG. However, the four new measures ALL showed improved rates. It is interesting to keep in mind that the rankings for these four components were provided by customers who had undergone a compliance action within the last year.

Finally, in Table 6 we have provided the survey results broken out by ITG Field Group. From Table 6, one can see that Navajo Chapters have significantly increased their rating of overall satisfaction with products and services produced by ITG. This may be a direct result of benchmarking and applying best practices used in Alaska in FY 2006/2007. These segments have similar compliance characteristics, and intensive outreach efforts applied in Alaska were expanded to the Navajo Chapters in FY 2008. Similar customer satisfaction improvements had been experienced in Alaska. Other overall satisfaction increases occurred in Alaska (7%) and Southwest (8%). Despite the increase in overall satisfaction, it is interesting to note that the Southwest group is showing decreased satisfaction in eight of the ten categories. Conversely, Groups 7280 and 7284 showed considerable decreases in overall satisfaction, down 13% and 12% respectively.

**Table 6 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores- by ITG Field Group**

7280		7281		7282		7283		7284		AK		NAV		
2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	
<b>Burden/ Delivery of Information</b>														
Satisfied	85%	80%	71%	83%	80%	79%	83%	84%	55%	58%	71%	68%	46%	60%
Neutral	11%	16%	16%	13%	14%	10%	10%	11%	40%	27%	19%	21%	21%	18%
Dissatisfied	4%	4%	13%	4%	6%	10%	7%	6%	5%	15%	10%	11%	33%	21%
<b>Collaborate</b>														
Satisfied	72%	60%	65%	70%	79%	63%	68%	79%	39%	39%	62%	63%	45%	52%
Neutral	24%	26%	24%	27%	12%	28%	18%	12%	48%	48%	29%	24%	31%	20%
Dissatisfied	4%	14%	11%	3%	9%	10%	14%	8%	12%	13%	8%	13%	24%	28%
<b>Recognition</b>														
Satisfied	84%	78%	70%	90%	72%	63%	77%	75%	50%	48%	69%	70%	51%	59%
Neutral	14%	12%	23%	5%	28%	24%	13%	20%	36%	33%	24%	19%	39%	25%
Dissatisfied	2%	10%	7%	5%	0%	13%	9%	5%	14%	18%	7%	11%	11%	16%
<b>Protocol/ Horizontal Equity</b>														
Satisfied	82%	74%	90%	87%	75%	78%	83%	83%	57%	54%	72%	75%	60%	70%
Neutral	14%	24%	9%	6%	20%	19%	12%	15%	31%	38%	23%	20%	31%	22%
Dissatisfied	5%	2%	1%	7%	5%	3%	5%	2%	12%	8%	5%	5%	9%	8%
<b>Accuracy/ Timeliness/ Honesty</b>														
Satisfied	69%	64%	65%	69%	60%	55%	74%	70%	47%	28%	61%	59%	45%	55%
Neutral	25%	27%	27%	28%	37%	30%	10%	22%	41%	55%	32%	31%	31%	27%
Dissatisfied	6%	9%	8%	3%	3%	16%	16%	8%	13%	17%	8%	10%	24%	18%
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>														
Satisfied	90%	77%	76%	76%	75%	83%	86%	88%	56%	44%	75%	82%	50%	64%
Neutral	10%	18%	12%	24%	25%	8%	5%	6%	33%	31%	23%	13%	36%	29%
Dissatisfied	0%	5%	12%	0%	0%	8%	8%	6%	11%	25%	2%	4%	14%	7%
<b>Compliance Action - Overall Satisfaction</b>														
Satisfied	67%	52%	80%	79%	100%	75%	78%	79%	43%	58%	70%	86%	67%	84%
Neutral	17%	14%	7%	11%	0%	25%	9%	16%	33%	26%	22%	14%	0%	9%
Dissatisfied	17%	33%	13%	11%	0%	0%	13%	5%	24%	16%	7%	0%	33%	7%
<b>Compliance Action - Initial Meeting</b>														
Satisfied	78%	79%	95%	83%	94%	81%	90%	95%	71%	88%	87%	100%	87%	90%
Neutral	10%	18%	3%	17%	6%	6%	1%	5%	25%	8%	12%	0%	12%	10%
Dissatisfied	13%	4%	3%	0%	0%	13%	8%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Compliance Action - Subsequent Interactions</b>														
Satisfied	74%	67%	70%	88%	100%	75%	84%	94%	56%	35%	89%	100%	60%	91%
Neutral	17%	22%	13%	6%	0%	17%	4%	6%	36%	55%	11%	0%	0%	7%
Dissatisfied	9%	11%	17%	6%	0%	8%	13%	0%	8%	10%	0%	0%	40%	2%
<b>Compliance Action - Final Resolution</b>														
Satisfied	68%	87%	67%	67%	78%	50%	92%	87%	43%	67%	71%	100%	50%	72%
Neutral	12%	7%	25%	27%	11%	42%	8%	10%	43%	33%	19%	0%	0%	18%
Dissatisfied	20%	7%	8%	7%	11%	8%	0%	3%	14%	0%	10%	0%	50%	10%

## Special Analysis

Past analysis of the ITG customer base revealed similarities between the Alaska Native Villages and the Navajo Chapters. Both segments tend to be remotely located, have smaller government structures, few large business or gaming operations, and meager staff resources.

Two years ago, ITG implemented several initiatives in Alaska to increase our visibility and impact among those taxpayers. As noted on last year's survey, the satisfaction rate among the Alaska customers greatly increased. In the past year ITG applied lessons learned in Alaska to the Navajo Chapters.

Table 7 shows the results of these efforts. The Navajo satisfaction ratings have increased in every category, while the rates are still holding steady in Alaska. In comparison, ratings for the rest of the US have all decreased in the past year. While Alaska and Navajo customers are not yet to the satisfaction levels of larger entities, continued, specialized focus on these customers appears to be required in order to meet their needs.

**Table 7 ITG Customer Satisfaction Survey Scores - Special Analysis**

	ALASKA		NAVAJO CHAPTERS		ALL OTHERS	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008
<b>Burden/Delivery of Information</b>						
Satisfied	71%	68%	46%	60%	78%	78%
Neutral	19%	21%	21%	18%	15%	15%
Dissatisfied	10%	11%	33%	21%	7%	7%
<b>Collaborate</b>						
Satisfied	62%	63%	45%	52%	67%	65%
Neutral	29%	24%	31%	20%	23%	25%
Dissatisfied	8%	13%	24%	28%	10%	9%
<b>Recognition</b>						
Satisfied	69%	70%	51%	59%	74%	73%
Neutral	24%	19%	39%	25%	19%	18%
Dissatisfied	7%	11%	11%	16%	7%	9%
<b>Protocol/Horizontal Equity</b>						
Satisfied	72%	75%	60%	70%	80%	77%
Neutral	23%	20%	31%	22%	15%	19%
Dissatisfied	5%	5%	9%	8%	5%	4%
<b>Accuracy/Timeliness/Honesty</b>						
Satisfied	61%	59%	45%	55%	68%	60%
Neutral	32%	31%	31%	27%	22%	30%
Dissatisfied	8%	10%	24%	18%	11%	10%
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>						
Satisfied	75%	82%	50%	64%	82%	76%
Neutral	23%	13%	36%	29%	12%	16%
Dissatisfied	2%	4%	14%	7%	7%	8%

## **Recommendations**

ITG should take the following actions relevant to Customer Satisfaction:

- Post the results of the survey on the ITG web site
- Share the results with all ITG employees
- Review areas where ITG scored relatively low, revisit the corresponding program/ services relevant to those areas, and develop actions to implement methods to improve performance
- Review areas where ITG scored relatively high to see what program /services are working and if any best practices might be ascertained
- Utilize the regional Consultation Listening meetings (four per year are scheduled in differing BIA regions) in areas where further study is needed to ascertain the reasons for responses/response rates.
- Continue to implement innovative alternative approaches for delivering products/services to tribes located in Alaska and Navajo Chapters
- Develop and implement communication mechanisms to address the issue of horizontal equity, through ITG News and Consultation Listening meetings
- Review the effectiveness of the survey effort to determine what changes should be made for next year's survey

## Appendix

OMB Control# 1545-1432

### Indian Tribal Governments Customer Satisfaction Survey

The Office of Indian Tribal Governments (ITG) within the IRS is asking for your input to help us evaluate how well we are serving your needs. Your responses will help us identify the areas where we can improve our products/services. No identifying information is required, and your response will be kept confidential. Thank you for your input.

**Please read each question carefully, and then mark the appropriate box from the scale (where 1 means "Strongly Agree" and 5 means "Strongly Disagree") to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.**

<b>The first eight questions will consider how ITG reduces TAXPAYER BURDEN and controls DELIVERY OF INFORMATION to the Tribes.</b>	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know/Not Applicable
1. It is hard to call and reach the Tribe's assigned Specialist.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. The Tribe rarely needs to talk to more than one employee to get an answer to a question.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. It is easy to access the IRS internet site.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. It is hard to get the tax information by calling the Office of ITG.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. Forms, Publications & other written materials are available on the IRS internet site.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. ITG has specific tax publications that meet tribal information needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
7. Specialist(s) provide explanations the Tribe can understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
8. The IRS internet site is <u>not</u> user friendly.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>The following four questions look at the COLLABORATION between ITG and the Tribe.</b>						
	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know/Not Applicable
9. The Office of ITG assists the Tribe in avoiding penalties.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
10. The Office of ITG does <u>not</u> explain how tax law changes affect the Tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
11. The Office of ITG works with the Tribe to help resolve any tax issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
12. Assistance given by the Office of ITG interferes with Tribal sovereignty.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>The following four questions measure how ITG manages the RECOGNITION OF GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIP.</b>						
	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know/Not Applicable
13. The Office of ITG seeks to build a respectful relationship.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
14. The Office of ITG wants to work with the Tribe to administer the tax law.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
15. The Office of ITG does <u>not</u> clarify tax issues that are unique to the Tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
16. The Office of ITG helps the Tribe comply with the tax law.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>The following five questions will consider the HORIZONTAL EQUITY and PROTOCOL of the services provided by ITG.</b>						
	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know/Not Applicable
17. The Office of ITG is respectful of Tribal culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
18. The Office of ITG is courteous in its contacts with the Tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
19. The Tribe will contact the Office of ITG when it has a problem and/or question.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
20. The Office of ITG works with the Tribe on a government-to-government basis.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
21. ITG always explains the reason for their compliance contact.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>The following five questions will measure the ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, and HONESTY of the services provided by ITG.</b>						
	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know/Not Applicable
22. The Office of ITG works with the Tribe to explain filing requirements to tribal members.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
23. The Office of ITG provides a timely response to the Tribe's questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
24. The Office of ITG does <u>not</u> keep the Tribe informed of its actions to resolve an issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
25. The Office of ITG fairly applies the tax law to the Tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
26. Overall, the Tribe is satisfied with the products and services provided by the Office of ITG.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<b>Please answer YES or NO to the following question:</b>						
	YES ▼	NO ▼				
27. Within the past year has your tribe had its books and/or records reviewed in a compliance check or examination by ITG?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

If you answered "Yes" to question 27, continue to question 28. If you answered "No", proceed to Comments, question 42.

